

REMARKS

Claims 1-14 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. New claims 15-20 have been added. Accordingly, claims 15-20 are currently pending in the above-identified application.

Priority

On March 1, 2004, Applicants submitted the priority document (JP 11-322117, filed November 12, 1999). Applicants request acknowledgment of the claim for priority and an indication that the document has been safely received. A copy of the mailroom, date-stamped receipt is enclosed as evidence that the document was filed.

35 U.S.C. §112

All of the previously pending claims have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer in favor of new claims 15-20. Claims 15-20 overcome the antecedent basis issue raised by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-2, 5-6 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al (U.S. Patent

No. 6,553,418) in view of Sandelman et al (U.S. Patent No. 6,717,513). These rejections are traversed as follows.

For purpose of clarity, all of the previously pending claims have been canceled in favor of new claims 15-20. The correspondence between the new claims and the previously pending claims is as follows. Claims 15-20 correspond to previously pending claims 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 14, respectively.

The Examiner had indicated in the Office Action that claims 4 and 8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. This has been done for new claims 16 and 18, which correspond to previously pending claims 4 and 8. In addition, claim 14 has been written into independent form as new claim 20. Therefore, claims 16, 18 and 20 are clearly in condition for allowance. Applicant's wish to point out to the Examiner that the "that consists of" or "consisting of" language in the preamble of previously pending claims 6, 8, 10 and 14 has been changed to "having" in new claims 17-20.

With respect to claims 15, 17 and 19, Applicants respond as follows. These claims all recite that the environment information includes an attention level at which a person is attracted attention and an attention object. These claims also recite that when the attention level of the attention


object is low, a control instruction is set to make the attention level of the attention object higher than the low attention level.

It is submitted that none of the cited references disclose this feature of the present invention. Applicants' note that the Examiner does not point out in the Office Action where any of these cited references disclose this claimed feature. As such, it is submitted that the pending claims patentably define the present invention over the cited art.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants contend that the above-identified application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and reexamination are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Shrinath Malur
Registration No. 34,663
Attorney for Applicant(s)

MATTINGLY, STANGER & MALUR
1800 Diagonal Rd., Suite 370
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1120
Date: August 20, 2004